Machaut's allegorical narratives and the Roman de la Rose

Machaut's Allegorical Narratives and the *Roman de la Rose*

Margaret J. Ehrhart
Fairleigh Dickinson University

The *Roman de la Rose* uses the allegorical dream-vision to explore the psychological and moral nuances of courtly love. Guillaume de Machaut spent most of his literary life rewriting the *Rose*, beginning with his first narrative poem, the *Dit dou vergier*, and culminating in the *Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse*. This article will explore Machaut's development as a creator of allegory and his ongoing debt to the *Rose*, and it will show that the *Fonteinne amoureuse* is his most successful imitation of his model.

Like the *Rose*, Machaut aimed to criticize courtly love; like the *Rose*, he took an oblique approach - in his case necessitated by the fact that he wrote for a courtly audience.[1] Since allegory creates an audience of readers of allegory, a select and discriminating group, it has always beckoned readers with a challenge: understand - or don't. So the *Rose* was a natural model for his enterprise. Centuries of critical debate about its meaning bear witness to the success of its teasing irony. But Machaut assimilated only piecemeal the techniques that enabled the *Rose* to let us glimpse the unseen through the seen and delineate its narrator-lover's moral state.

His first three narratives, the *Dit dou vergier*, the *Jugement dou roy de Behaingne*, and the *Remede de fortune*, are superficially very similar to the *Rose*, but the imitation is stylistic rather than structural. The next four, the *Dit dou Lyon*, the *Dit de l'alerion*, the *Jugement dou roy de Navarre*, and the *Confort d'ami*, are less obvious in their debt. As we shall see, however, the *Lyon* and the *Alerion* have more in common with the *Rose* structurally. And the *Jugement dou roy de Navarre* and the *Confort d'ami* initiate Machaut's experimentation with classical myth - a significant aspect of the *Rose*'s technique and the essential key to Machaut's success in the *Fonteinne amoureuse*.

The essence of the *Rose* can be summarized by recalling that allegory says one thing to mean another.[2] We sometimes speak of this other meaning as the 'deeper meaning', and allegory anciently implied

a sacred or privileged communication.[3] The reader is led into allegory through a surface that makes it impossible to take the story literally, perhaps an unrealistic setting with symbolic overtones, and/or surreal details.[4] We might meet characters we could never meet in real life. Thus personification is a technique of allegory, as is the use of mythological characters.[5] Venus brings to an allegory a more complex significance than does, for example, Wealth, but she is like Wealth in that we need not wait for her actions to define her.[6]

Medieval allegory also used other techniques to convey the abstract. Certain patterns or themes lend themselves to allegorical development, the battle or the quest, for example; the forms themselves provide familiar tracks for interpretation.[7] Thus we might say the richest allegory is dynamic - narrative - as opposed to static allegory, which is descriptive.[8] This allegory based on patterns or themes has been called typological allegory. One narrative, because of its agreed-upon meaning, serves as the key to another.[9] It is no accident that the greatest flowering of the allegorical poem coincided with a period that saw great assimilation of classical myth. Using classical exempla in allegorical literature was a way to urge the reader toward interpretation. The embedded exemplum serves as a gloss on the text.

The *Roman de la Rose* is thus an allegory on several counts. First, it uses symbolic settings, notably the garden. The garden, with its related image, the fountain, brings associations from the Bible, the courtly-love lyric, and classical literature. Second, it uses personifications and mythological figures. A cast of personifications from Deduit to Raison reveals how love plays its part in the courtly life, how wealth helps men gain ladies' favors, how humans have within them that voice, overlooked in the passion of youth, that urges moderation. And we recognize the God of Love and his mother Venus as figures from classical myth. Third, it has a quest structure. Amant sees the rose, falls in love, and gets what he wants. Yet the surface disjointure makes us look for a deeper meaning. Why would a young man fall in love with a rosebud? Hints make us see the rose as more than a rose - from the sexual double entendres to the fact that the God of Love is involved in the quest and that every reference to what Amant wants from the rose can be translated into what a man wants from a woman. And we have active or dynamic allegory throughout. Amant is in quest of the rose and he attains it. In his pursuit and conquest, he defines both courtly love and himself. Related to the quest theme in the *Rose* are the themes of battle and debate. Fourth, it

uses mythological stories as exempla with attached meanings. In other words, it uses typological allegory. These stories illuminate episodes in the poem to guide interpretation. Narcissus's story - he died loving his reflection - parallels Amant's falling in love with the rose as a result of gazing in the fountain. And Pygmalion's story glosses Amant's contemplation of the tower he is about to climb in his final assault on the rose. And finally the poem teases us with the promise that all will be explained - a promise that perhaps Guillaume means to fulfill. Jean picks up on it but at that point it has become a joke.

In the *Vergier*, *Behaingne*, and *Remede*, the surface trappings of allegorical narrative function as homage to the *Rose*. They announce that the poems will explore courtly love in a style that allows abstractions to interact with humans. But these works do not imitate the structure of the *Rose* - a dynamic allegory in which the lover is literally a *protagonist* - defining both himself and courtly love through his actions. They imitate the *Rose* in the same way that inexperienced writers often imitate their idols: style is easy to copy, and a captivating style often obscures just what makes a great creation really great.

The *Dit dou vergier* uses a symbolic landscape, personifications and figures from myth (God of Love = Cupid), and iconographical attributes that symbolize the way love works.[10] The narrator awakes on an April morning, enters a garden, and follows a path to a *vergier*. But the place does not cheer him because his love is unrequited. He is so unhappy that he falls into a trance. Six ladies and six gentlemen are adoring a creature sitting on a flowering tree - winged, handsome but blind, and wearing a chaplet of flowers. In the creature's right hand is an arrow, in the left a torch. Though the narrator fears the torch, he approaches and salutes the company. The creature on the tree greets him, identifies himself as the God of Love, and describes his power. He lacks eyes because he ignores beauty and rank. With his arrow, he seizes lovers' hearts; with his torch, he captures their bodies. His wings show he rules the world. The gentlemen are Voloir, Penser, Dous Plaisir, Loiauté, Celer, and Desir. The ladies are Grace, Pitié, Esperance, Souvenir, Franchise, and Attemprance. The gentlemen enamor a lover and urge him on; Dangier, Paour, Honte, Durté, Cruauté, and Doubtance de Mespresure resist them, but the ladies overcome these forces. The narrator asks the God to change *his* lady's heart. The God tells him to be loyal and secret, and the narrator is

cheered. As the God flies away, dew falls on the narrator's face and brings him back to himself.

Like the *Rose*, the *Vergier* has a first-person lover-narrator. It takes place on a spring morning in a *vergier* described as an earthly paradise. It posits an altered state of mind in order to admit surreal elements. The scene in which Machaut's narrator sees the flowering tree recalls the scene in which Amant sees the rosebush; both the tree and the rosebush have lovely smells.[11] Machaut's narrator calls his beloved the flower of all ladies (v.126). Each poem has a winged God of Love (*Vergier* v.173; *Rose* v.10582) though Machaut makes the God blind too (v.167). The God's arrow in the *Vergier* recalls the arrows of the God of Love in the *Rose*; his torch recalls Venus's torch. As in the *Rose*, the shock of an arrow and the heat of a torch evoke the psychological and physical effects of romantic love. And in each poem, the god indoctrinates the narrator in courtly service.

In the *Rose*, Amant fell in love when he saw the rosebush, with the sexual implications of its rosebuds and fragrance. This love led to his encounter with the God of Love because he had to learn the rules of love so he could try to pluck the rose. Machaut conflates these ideas into the notion of the God of Love sitting on the flowering tree; the God is linked with the complex of associations conveyed by a flowering tree situated in a hidden place that seems a paradise. His position *on* the tree makes him master of all it represents.

In the *Rose*, Amant's first attempts to win the rose were prompted by the God's arrows, starting with Biauté, and he was comforted by Esperance, Douz Penser, etc., as he pressed forward. Meanwhile, the rose's protectors, the *villain* Dangier and the rest, repelled his efforts. In the second part of the poem, this relatively civil process escalated into a battle between the God of Love's barons and the rose's protectors. In the *Vergier* the God's ladies and gentlemen recall the personifications in the *Rose*. The God tells how they overcome the *villains* who resist the lover.

The *Vergier* hints at dynamic allegory. The gentlemen and ladies *adore* the God of Love. The narrator *fears* the torch. And the poem contains a mini version of the *Rose*'s central action - narrated, though, rather than acted: the passage describing how the gentlemen and ladies aid a lover.[12] But in the *Rose*, the narrator-lover is genuinely the protagonist in the allegorical action. And Amant does not fall in love until the poem has begun. It is his *actions* as he attempts to gain the rose that delineate the personality of a lover and his moral state.

The *Vergier* is then, ultimately, not a dynamic allegory. It talks about concepts of courtly love without making its narrator-lover experience them. As we saw, dynamic allegory needs action. Machaut's narrator is already a lover when the poem begins and still unrequited when it ends.[13] A further sign that we have static allegory rather than dynamic is the fact that Machaut *explains* his allegorical elements; Guillaume and Jean did not. Since theme or pattern can be such an important dimension of allegory, allegory without action could conceivably lack an interpretive key. Thus, perhaps, allegory without action requires a built-in gloss. The God tells *why* he is blind and winged. Significantly too, the dream - here a trance - is only part of the poem. In the *Rose*, the dream permitted the surreal elements that were the allegory's material. But much of the *Vergier* occurs outside the trance.[14] Thus, while the *Vergier* recalls the *Rose*, it lacks the action that puts ideas into play.

In Machaut's second narrative, the *Jugement dou roy de Behaingne*, we again have a surface imitation of the *Rose*, but not a dynamic allegory.[15] On a May morning, the narrator, a lover, overhears a knight and lady debating who has greater sorrow. The knight's beloved has been unfaithful; the lady's has died. The narrator proposes the King of Bohemia as judge, then leads them to the king's residence at Durbui. The knight tells their stories. The king takes counsel from his court of personified abstractions and decides in favor of the knight.

As in the *Rose* we have the effect of a symbolic landscape - though the *Behaingne* features a real king Machaut once served, and its main episode occurs at a real castle.[16] Machaut begins with a spring morning, and, though he does not follow through with a dream vision,[17] Durbui is described as a world set apart. It is walled, it is surrounded by water and lovely *vergiers*, and it even has a marble fountain. A porter admits the party and they are greeted by Honneur and Courtoisie. All this evokes the *Rose* to such an extent that we accept abstractions interacting with humans as in a dream-vision. And, like Deduit, the king has a court of personified abstractions, among them, from the *Rose*, Largesse, Richesse, Biauté, Franchise, Courtoisie and Juenesse; whilst Desir, Penser and Volenté recall the abstractions with which Machaut delineated the love experience in the *Vergier*; they derive ultimately from the *Rose*.[18]

The *Behaingne* is in one respect modeled on a tradition other than that of the *Rose*: the love-debate or *jeu parti,* a poem that debates a question of love. But the *Rose* has its own love-debate elements as

well.[19] In the *Rose*, characters like Raison, Venus and the God of Love struggled for the heart and mind of Amant, thus delineating the moral aspects of courtly love. In the *Behaingne*, Raison, Amour, Loiauté and Juenesse debate whether the knight or the lady has suffered the most. Amour holds that a lover should serve loyally no matter what; Raison argues that love is only carnal. The knight is suffering because he plunged wholeheartedly into a love as desperate as that which caused Amant to pursue the rose. Thus when Amour upholds his case while Raison chastises him, we get much the same moral slant as we get in the *Rose*. As in the *Rose*, Raison is almost too sensible in her insistence that all love is carnal and that the knight is a fool to persist.[20] But structurally the *Behaingne* is very different from the *Rose*. Machaut borrows elements of the *Rose*'s symbolic landscape, but not so as to *use* them - rather as conventions to mark the genre. The poem's allegory is not dynamic. Both the knight and the narrator are in love when the poem starts and remain so when it ends. Love is defined not by action but by the speeches Machaut's personified characters make.

Machaut's next allegorical narrative, the *Remede de fortune*, continues to borrow from the *Rose* the concept that an encounter with personified abstractions in a garden can provide an opportunity to discuss love.[21] Like the *Rose*, it critiques the courtly love which its narrator, sometimes even referred to in the manuscript's rubrics as 'L'Amant',[22] pursues. The lady who is the object of the narrator's unrequited love finds a lay he wrote in her honor. When she asks about it, he is struck dumb and flees into a park. There, by a fountain, he utters a *complainte* against Fortune. Then, in a trance, he is visited by a beautiful lady. She diagnoses him as an unhappy lover and comforts him, interspersing her speech with songs. He falls asleep, still in his trance, but awakes from both sleep and trance when she puts a ring on his finger. She says she is Esperance and links her advice about love to Fortune. The narrator returns to his lady, who accepts his love briefly, but then rejects him again.

Like the *Rose*, the *Remede* chronicles the adventures of a first-person lover-narrator. When he talks of love (vv.167-356), his language recalls the instructions of the God of Love[23] - though like the *Behaingne*, the *Remede* alludes to Machaut's 'real' identity as clerk and poet, and evokes fourteenth-century court life. Its embedded lyrics - uttered by both the narrator and Esperance - make it almost an 'ars poetica', thus referring to Machaut's 'real' self.[24] The garden, too,

clearly recalls the garden in the *Rose*: it has a high wall, is entered through a wicket, and contains every delight. The vision occurs by a fountain.[25] Again, though, the glimpses of courtly folk at beginning and end - even the fact that the park, the Parc de Hedin, is a real park, like Durbui in the *Behaingne*, give a slice-of-life feeling.[26]

Of course, as Brownlee says, in the *Rose* the vision contains the garden; in the *Remede*, the garden contains the vision. In the *Rose*, everything happens in Amant's dream. In the *Remede*, the narrator's vision is only *part* of the poem. Half his encounter with Esperance even occurs outside his vision - he is awake after she puts a ring on his finger. But so thoroughly does the garden evoke the garden of the *Rose* that we accept it as a place where, even awake, one can interact with emissaries from the world of ideas.

In the *Remede*, we meet only one abstraction: Esperance. Though Machaut's debt for the scenes in which she comforts and berates the narrator is to Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*,[27] Esperance clearly derives from the *Rose*; in creating her, Machaut made a character from a concept only loosely personified in the earlier poem (*Rose* vv.2610-25, 4035-69).[28] Esperance also evokes Raison in the *Rose*.[29] She offers herself to the narrator in words that recall Raison's (vv.2083-84; *Rose* vv.5812-13) and she tells him to follow reason (v.2486). The length and didacticism of her speeches, too, recall Raison's.[30] As in the *Rose*, a personified abstraction urges reasonable love. Thus the *Remede* picks up the debate aspect of the *Rose*.

Probably also indebted to the *Rose* is a central theme of Esperance's first speech: the shield that reigns in loyal hearts - blue with a red heart pierced by an arrow of burning iron. Its motto is 'Qui sueffre, il vaint' ('He who suffers conquers'; v.1888); its straps are hope. In the narrator, the straps are defective because he lacks hope. This emblematic device recalls aspects of the *Rose* like the God of Love's arrows and Venus's brand, and even more directly, the shields used in the battle at the Rose's climax (e.g., vv.15435-38, 15445-46, 15465-68, 15492-95).

But the *Remede* does not replicate the *Rose*'s allegory. Again we have static allegory, not dynamic. The garden evokes the *Rose* and, with the trance/sleep, offers a setting appropriate to a personified Esperance. It does not function as a symbolic setting though; that is, it does not give meaning to the narrator's actions. Nor does the fountain have allegorical resonance. Another sign that we lack dynamic allegory is the fact that the narrator's state remains constant.

He is unrequited when the poem begins and unrequited when it ends. Even the shield is only *described* - though its emblematic features derive from elements of the *Rose* that are genuinely allegorical, and the idea itself comes from the battle in which the poem's allegorical oppositions play themselves out in concrete form. At no point does the narrator of the *Remede* even put the shield on - an action that might follow logically from the episode in which Esperance gives him hope.[31]

Machaut's approach to allegory was to change radically with his next two poems, the *Dit dou lyon* and the *Dit de l'alerion*. Each evokes the *Rose* in its use of a lover-narrator and a garden setting, but neither depends on personifications or figures from myth. Machaut has set aside one of the most obvious stylistic features of his model. Instead, he has turned to beast lore for his inspiration. Despite the fact that on the surface these works resemble the *Rose* much less than did the first three narratives, they are closer to his model structurally because both are dynamic allegories. A surreal surface draws us into the world of the unseen, and characters' actions reflect psychological and moral truths.

The *Lyon* begins on a spring morning.[32] The narrator wishes to test his status as a lover by visiting an island *vergier* that admits only the loyal. Awakened before dawn by birds, he happens upon a boat that takes him there. Once ashore, he admires the island's beauties until thoughts of his unrequited love distract him and he loses his way. Suddenly he is in a field of thorns. A lion approaches. Fearing death, the narrator commends himself to his lady, whereupon the lion's manner changes. Like a dog, it takes his robe in its teeth and offers itself as a guide. Passing through thorns, they meet beasts that threaten the lion, but at last they reach their destination, a lovely woman's court. She sits near a fountain. The lion approaches her meekly, wanting to tell her of its pain and her power. But suddenly the beasts appear, among them one with two horns. It screeches and the lady looks at it; the lion goes mad. The narrator wonders about the lion's subjection, the beasts, and the boat. A knight explains that once the island admitted all lovers, but then a powerful lord enclosed it with the river and provided the boat that accepts only the loyal. The island is the 'Esprueve de fines amours' (v.1778). Envy makes the beasts mistreat the lion, but it endures its sufferings because the lady obtained it when it was young and has conquered it. Its only weapon is to suffer and appear to enjoy its pain.

The allegorical dimension is obvious. Though the *Lyon* begins with its narrator waking up, the work has a dream-like quality. A spring-morning adventure in an island *vergier* with a fountain, a magic boat, thorn fields, a beautiful woman and beasts that act human teases us to look for a key - because things seem to mean more, or other, than they appear. The bestiary materials also nudge us toward interpretation. Like classical myth, the natural world had a long history of imposed allegory, and the bestiary tradition had for centuries seen moral and ethical significance in animals.[33] And when the narrator asks about the island's enigmas, we recall Amant's promises in the *Rose* that a key would be provided, that all would be explained. It has been pointed out, however, that the 'explanation' of the island given in the *Lyon* does not really gloss the allegory.[34] We are never told, for example, what the thorns or the two-horned beast are. But since the island is called the 'Esprueve de fines amours' and admits only loyal lovers, we assume that whatever happens there is meant to define loyalty in love and examine its implications.

Even a casual examination of the symbolism suggests that Machaut, using very different materials, is nonetheless following the *Rose* in fashioning a damning critique of courtly love. The boat is, on some level, probably the magic boat of romance.[35] But Machaut included a similar boat in the *Remede* as a metaphor for losing control of one's destiny (vv.2577-82). The image comes from the *Consolation of Philosophy*, where it describes what happens if one places one's trust in goods of Fortune.[36] The boat in the *Lyon* has a rudder (v.893), but the rudder is never used; thus, once one has stepped aboard, one cannot steer. To be admitted to the 'Esprueve de fines amours', then, is to lose control over one's destiny. The island admits only the loyal, but the boat is covered with green silk (vv.147-48). Green means novelty in Machaut's *Dit de la fleur de lis et de la marguerite*.[37] In the *Voir-dit*, when his mistress changes from a blue dress to green, the narrator fears her affections have changed.[38] And in the *Remede*, blue represents loyalty on the shield of a faithful lover (vv.1903-4); green is excluded because it represents novelty (v.1909). But perhaps green shows the fickle nature of Fortune and the change that plagues her followers.[39]

From afar, the island seems a paradise, and when the narrator arrives, he finds the pleasances he expected. But he also finds fields of thorns whose pricks make him bleed (vv.356-60). As in the *Rose*, an exclusive garden suggests the exclusive life of the courtly lover. But

the island reflects love's painful dimension too. The link between the pains of love and the thorns of Venus's roses is old.[40] Moreover, among the thorns are beasts that terrorize the lion (vv.407-27). Though Calin sees the beasts as *losengiers*, slanderers who, in the lyric tradition, destroy the poet's reputation with his lady,[41] I see them as lovers - the lion's rivals. *Losengiers* are identified with insincere lovers - and the island admits only the loyal. Envy drives the beasts (vv.1845-78); they love the lady and they torment the lion because they envy her care for him (vv.1922-32). He, in return, envies them. When the lady looks at the beasts, the lion goes mad (vv.615-20). And just as the beasts appear at the lady's court, the lion appears among the thorns. Even the narrator, a loyal lover, strays into the landscape of envy as he muses on his lady. If the beautiful parts of the island are emblematic of loyalty, and the thorny parts emblematic of envy, the fact that the beasts are sometimes at court and the lion sometimes among thorns suggests that envy and loyalty are related. The beasts also imply that courtly love is not only envy-ridden but unreasonable. It was a classical commonplace that reason separates man from animals; Raison opposes courtly love in the *Rose*, Machaut's *Behaingne* and numerous other works. And what of the lion as the main 'character'? The lion is king of beasts, highest on the scale of animal creation - in the medieval scheme of hierarchies, parallel with the king. Yet in the *Lyon*, this noble creature is humiliated by the other beasts and his lady.[42]

Clearly the *Lyon* uses the techniques of dynamic allegory - characters interact within a symbolic landscape to define themselves. But the poem is notably inscrutable. I would like to propose that it was as inscrutable to its contemporary audience as it is to us, and that its reception explains why Machaut furnished his next narrative, the *Alerion*, with a running commentary.

Like the *Lyon*, the *Alerion* fashions beast lore into a dynamic allegory that analyzes and critiques courtly love. But, unlike the *Lyon*, the poem includes detailed glosses. The glosses have been said to destroy the effect of the allegory: if the audience is not to have the pleasure of recognizing how, for example, a sparrow hawk that eats small birds is like a lady who exploits her charm, why write an allegory?[43] But allegorical expression is tricky. How does one keep the reader reading on two levels at once, recognizing with pleasure how the vehicle both reveals and illuminates the tenor? In the *Lyon*, we know that everything means something, but we are never sure

what - except for the broad outlines. The *Alerion* is even more ambitious, and its premise has a great deal to recommend it. Sexuality viewed in terms of bird imagery may be a cliché, but it always delights. Machaut, however, wanted his vehicle to convey a tenor more complex than he trusted his audience to get unaided.

The *Dit de l'alerion* treats four love affairs by describing the narrator's experiences with four hunting birds.[44] At the start, we seem to be on literal ground. In his youth, the narrator loved little birds, then larger birds - then he wanted a bird of prey. But suddenly we are derailed. Nature inclined him to this *métier,* and Amour said to associate with hawking enthusiasts - and all the while, he hid his intent. What does Amour, with a capital 'A', have to do with falconry? And why should he hide his interest in the sport? Then we realize that the episode parallels Amant's joining the company of Deduit in the *Rose*. There, a young man at the age when young men think on love finds himself in a milieu where he can study the life to which he aspires. The *Alerion* is clearly a dynamic allegory; a bird fancier in action with birds images a lover in action with women. But Machaut seems not to have trusted his audience to catch the transfer of meaning. He comes along with an 'exemplum' - a gloss on the story he has just told: the would-be lover should gain experience by associating with other lovers. But he should cultivate *bien celer*: hide his intent.

Returning to his vehicle, the narrator tells how he thought to start with a newly taken bird and enjoy 'son juene revel' ('its young gaiety'), 'son moien temps' ('its middle time'), and 'sa haute perfection' ('its high perfection'; vv.314-18) - then glosses the passage to analyze loving an inexperienced woman. But without the gloss might we still not understand that he wanted a *young* woman - parallel to what the *Rose* expressed with the amusing business of roses in various states of bloom being passed over for a tight bud? He chooses a promising spot for his quest; there is no king, duke, or count it would not please (vv.456-57) - a sly quip that evokes the *Rose* and thus hints at the tenor of his allegory. There he watches a sparrow hawk eat a bird - and promptly prays to Amour! But the sparrow hawk flies away, heading southeast. Then comes the gloss: a lover is captivated by a sweet lady; that she flies toward the south means she despises obscure people.

Thus we move along, with glosses interspersed: he traps the sparrow hawk with a live bird for bait. He tames it and teaches it to hunt; it always returns to him. But his joy cannot last. The sparrow

hawk molts, and it is so changed that he loses it. He recalls that it has cold feet and clutches a small bird in its claws all night. The glosses explain how his adventure images young love: the lover should stretch the trap of fine appearance and inside it put sweet amorous regard or fine and courteous speech. When a lady has committed herself, though she enjoys herself in company, her heart always returns to her lover. And the lover's heart is the small bird clutched in the sparrow hawk's claws during the night when he finds only harshness. Machaut's glosses tell a parallel story of a lover's adventures, but the vehicle offers riches that the glosses ignore. The love affairs progress from less reasonable to more reasonable love.[45] And the episode of the sparrow hawk treats the extreme courtly love the *Rose* dealt with.

Unglossed details of the vehicle point up the masochistic undercurrent. The narrator traps the sparrow hawk, recalling the Ovidian component of courtly love.[46] The narrator's trap suggests anything but sincere love. His bait is courtly behavior - 'dous amoureus regart' ('sweet loving attention') and 'bel et courtoisement parler' ('speaking well and courteously'; vv.801-8) - surface nobility to cloak his motives. He refers to his trap as 'une courtoise decevance' ('a courteous deceit'; v.963). Further, his first glimpse of the sparrow hawk involves watching it eat a small bird (vv.539-41). As he reflects on how much he loves it, he wants it to trample on his heart (vv.914-19), and he reports without comment that it clutches a small bird all night in its claws - images that suggest courtly love's sadomasochism. As he sleeplessly waits for it in the garden, he trembles, shivers though it is summer, cannot sleep. But generally Machaut's glosses ignore the darker dimensions of courtly love his vehicle implies. Instead we get interpretations that are literally *imposed*, that do not rise naturally from the allegory.

The other three episodes - allerion, eagle, gerfalcon - unfold similarly. Having lost the sparrow hawk, the narrator borrows an allerion, which is then given to him because he praises it so fervently. And throughout we get imposed allegory - far beyond what we would see ourselves, but less satisfying for being explained: one lover might succeed through long service, another without effort. Each path is valid.[47] Honest love openly revealed wins a lady's heart. The allerion represents a higher form of love: it is rare, difficult to see, difficult to obtain (vv.1583-1612). So the love shown in this episode is uncommon, rarely enjoyed, unknown to most people.[48] The eagle can gaze at the sun, has lovely plumage, hunts masterfully. The sun at

which it gazes is Bonne Amour; only the pure can regard it. In Bonne Amour neither partner claims sovereignty.[49] A lady wears the eagle's plumage when she is honest, has wings of loyalty, and the like. The hunting prowess means that one look from the lady leads a lover into the domain of good loving.

The narrator cannot praise his gerfalcon enough. But one day he is hunting when it stoops to the ground and fastens on a horned owl, a lowly bird gentle raptors shun. The gloss says that lovers praise their ladies before they know them, that a true lover endures his lady's vagaries but sorrows when she dishonors herself with a lowly lover. But the vehicle already hints at a romantic drama in which a lover admires a woman, wins her by speaking of his love, overvalues her, tells himself her moods mean nothing, but then endures what he half foresaw: her defection to a lover he considers unworthy. The vehicle adds to the emotional tone of the story too, with the image of the soaring bird *stooping* to a vile prey from which it cannot pull free:

> . . . il choisi un chahuant,
> Un oisel lait, vil et puant,
> [...]
> Et le gerfaut (mar fust il nez!)
> Y fu si forment encharnez
> Qu'il ne s'en pooit desaerdre. (vv.4219-27)
>
> It chose a horned owl, an ugly, low, and foul bird. . . . And the gerfalcon (curse the day it was born!) fastened on so passionately that it could not detach itself. (my translation)

Note the pun on *encharnez*--implying that the lady is captured by the sensuality of her new lover rather than his character.

At last we reach the episode that accounts for the poem's name; without it, the allerion would be no more worthy than the other birds to have the *dit* named for it. In a *vergier* the narrator prays Amour to deliver him from his grief. Raison tells him not to mourn unduly. When he assents to her advice, he realizes the *vergier*'s beauty and feels great joy. Suddenly he sees a bird cutting toward the south. Then it is on his fist. It responds to his allerion's name and he recognizes his pearl on its foot. This conclusion alludes to the *Rose*, with the narrator in a garden being chastised by a Raison who recalls Jean de Meun's bossy creation. The symbolic landscape from the *Rose* is, I think, more powerful than the imposed allegory. We know that this

vergier is the one in which he obtained his sparrow hawk, but then it imaged the false paradise of courtly love. Now he understands reasonable love, and so it has become a true paradise. And he is awake, not dreaming or in a trance, as were those who enjoyed earthly paradises in Machaut's earlier poems. Even at the beginning of the *Alerion*, he says he was not asleep (vv.504-16). Thus in the *Lyon* and the *Alerion* we have, perhaps, two not entirely successful experiments. Beast lore unglossed is inscrutable and beast lore glossed loses much of allegory's point. Like irony, to which it is closely allied, allegory depends on an audience that is up to its interpretive task.

So Machaut turns next to classical myth. As Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun had recognized, myth brought with it a long interpretive tradition. Thus it was a highly effective way to bring meaning to an allegorical work - particularly when used in the context of what Barney calls typological allegory. Machaut's initial experiments with myth, the *Jugement dou roy de Navarre* and the *Confort d'ami*, do not, however, exploit its typological possibilities. But they do show us his developing interest in mythological material. In the *Navarre* and the *Confort*, the mythological stories are literally exempla - examples to support arguments.[50]

The *Jugement dou roy de Navarre* is a debate with personifications, a companion piece to the *Behaingne*.[51] The debate in the *Navarre* treats the courtly-love ideal of absolute devotion. Personified abstractions take positions, and the locus is a world apart - the king's court on a spring day. Summoned to the court by Bonneürté, or happiness, Machaut's first-person narrator Guillaume is taken to task for the *Behaingne* - with its conclusion in favor of the knight. He must defend his position against Bonneürté and a court of personified abstractions. The debate uses exempla; five are drawn from classical myth. For these, Machaut's chief source was probably the *Ovide moralisé*.[52] We see quite strikingly, though, that Machaut's use of myth is still in an experimental stage; sometimes his exempla do not fit their contexts, as in the episodes of Dido, Ariadne, and Medea. To prove that no pain compares with the pain of love, Pais tells of Dido's suicide after Aeneas deserts her. The story is also in the *Rose*, in a similar context: la Vieille tells it to show that men exploit women (vv.13143-80). But Machaut's version has elements that weaken it. As in the *Ovide moralisé* and, ultimately, the *Heroides*, Dido is pregnant (v.2121); moreover, she is said to be crazed by love. The story does show that love causes pain, but Dido is blamed for yielding to her pain. And her

pregnancy makes it hard to feel total sympathy; the unborn baby died too. The stories of Ariadne and - also in the *Rose* (vv.13199-13232) - Medea are used by Franchise to argue that ladies are more loyal. But Machaut adds that after they were deserted by their lovers, each found a new mate. Ariadne was rescued by Bacchus, and Medea was welcomed at the court of Aegeus.[53]

In the *Confort d'ami*, we see similar experimentation with myth and similar lack of fit between stories and their purposes. The work was written to console and advise the twenty-four-year-old Charles of Navarre - for whom Machaut also wrote the *Jugement dou roy de Navarre* - when John the Good imprisoned him in 1365.[54] The third section, the section that interests us, deals with the fact that prison separates lovers. It is heavily indebted to the *Rose*. It uses personified abstractions to speak about Charles's pain. Do Souvenir and Desir assault him? Has his Bon Espoir dwindled because he fears to lose his lady? Douce Penser will alleviate his sadness; his only error has been to lose hope. Then, as in the *Rose* - and the *Navarre* - mythological exempla are marshaled for support. From the *Ovide moralisé* comes the story of Orpheus,[55] whose hope led him to reclaim his wife from hell (vv.2277-2644). Machaut then moves to a second exemplum. Significantly, it is the same story he used in the *Fonteinne amoureuse*, but to subtler effect there. When Paris went after Helen, he hoped for her love.[56] But Paris's theft of Helen caused his own death and the destruction of Troy (vv.2652-72). The third exemplum is the story of Hercules and Deianira.[57] To win Deianira, Hercules fought the shape-shifting Achelous. But then he fell in love with Iole (vv.2727-33). To win him back, Deianira gave him a shirt Nessus gave her; supposedly the shirt would make him love her again. But the shirt was poisoned and Hercules died - only to be deified (vv.2734-42).

Did these stories comfort Charles as much as Machaut intended? Not only did Orpheus lose his wife again when he looked back, but the lovers were rejoined only after he renounced women and was stoned - not an appealing prospect. Paris's theft of Helen, though it shows hope helps gain a lady, also shows the bad effects of Paris's act, especially since Machaut alludes to Troy's fall. Hercules likewise undercuts Machaut's point. Hope of gaining Deianira sustained him when he fought Achelous, but then he forsook her and died when she tried to win him back.[58]

In the *Fonteinne amoureuse*, however, Machaut discovers a truly allegorical application of classical myth, thus emulating precisely

what Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun did in the *Rose*.[59] The *Fonteinne amoureuse* treats the adventures of its clerkly first-person narrator at the court of a young nobleman. Lying in bed one night, he overhears a poetic *complainte* lamenting its speaker's upcoming departure from the woman he loves and praying Morpheus to visit her in her sleep and make his love known. The next morning, the narrator meets the *complainte*'s author - the nobleman whose court he is visiting. The two enter a *vergier* containing a fountain decorated with the story of Narcissus and scenes from the Trojan War. This is the 'amorous fountain'; it has made many lovers die pitiful deaths. The nobleman reveals that he is an unrequited lover and asks the narrator to express his love in poetry. The narrator presents him with a copy of his own *complainte*. Then the two fall asleep and dream of Venus. In the dream, she is accompanied by the nobleman's beloved, and she carries a golden apple inscribed 'Donnee soit a la plus belle!' ('To be given to the most beautiful!'; v.1603). She explains its significance to the narrator; at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, Discorde threw the apple in the midst of the festivities because she resented being excluded. When Venus, Pallas, and Juno quarreled over it, Mercury led them to the Trojan prince Paris, who, unaware he was a prince, was living as a shepherd. Venus offered him the most beautiful woman on earth in exchange for the prize. Venus gives the nobleman his beloved, who pledges her love and exchanges her ring for his. When the dreamers awake, they discover the lady's ruby on the nobleman's hand. Then the narrator accompanies the nobleman to the coast for his departure.

An obvious debt to the *Rose* is the fact that the central episode occurs in a dream in a *vergier*. Like the *vergier* of the *Rose*, it has meadows, trees, birdsong, fruit and everything good, and it is compared to the terrestrial paradise (vv.1349-70). Also like the *vergier* of the *Rose*, it contains a fountain, and, as in the *Rose*, the fountain's decoration refers to the story of Narcissus.[60] Brownlee observes that as if to establish from the outset the *Roman de la Rose* as a literary analogue to the present scene, the first sentence spoken in the garden contains the word 'deduit' twice in the rhyme position.[61]

Moreover, the young nobleman is wearing a chaplet like that of Deduit in the *Rose*; Brownlee has pointed out that he parallels Amant as well.[62] The nobleman's beloved is said to be like a fairy (v.1595), echoing the description of Venus in the *Rose* (v.3410). And Jupiter

established the garden (v.1393), a detail perhaps inspired by this passage from the *Rose*:

> Jupiter, qui le monde regle,
> conmande et establist por regle
> que chascuns pense d'estre aese;
> et s'il set chose qui li plese,
> qu'il la face, s'il la peust fere,
> por soulaz a son queur atrere. (vv.20065-70)
>
> Jupiter, who rules the world, commands and establishes as a rule that each one think of living comfortably. If anyone knows of something which may please him, let him do it, if he can, in order to bring solace to his heart.[63]

By making the dream occur within the garden and thus after the poem is already 'in progress', Machaut brings dreaming to the forefront. In fact, he later referred to the *Fonteinne amoureuse* as 'the book of Morpheus'.[64] The nobleman introduces the theme of dreaming in his *complainte* when he recalls Ceyx and Alcyone and asks Morpheus to visit his lady in her sleep (v.715). The story confirms that a lover can appear to his beloved in sleep. The nobleman says it would be good if his lady believed dreams were true (vv.779-84). His belief that dreams can link lovers is borne out by the shared dream - and the narrator says he considers it true (vv.1563-68). The nobleman thinks this visit from his lady means Morpheus heard his prayer, and he resolves to honor the god with a temple (v.2559). The episode shows that dreams are true - a point also emphasized in the *Rose*.

But Machaut's most significant debt to the *Rose* lies in his use of myth. Like the authors of the *Rose*, he uses it to create the type of allegory that Stephen Barney calls typological. A well-known story - in this case a mythological story - with a well-established meaning is embedded in a work that echoes the myth's pattern. The writer creates an atmosphere that draws us away from the literal - by means of a dream or vision format and/or personified abstractions and allegorical imagery. As we read, we recall the myth's meaning, and we see that the work demands to be interpreted in terms of the myth.[65] Guillaume de Lorris's section of the *Rose* is informed by the Narcissus story, Jean de Meun's by Pygmalion. Machaut also uses two complementary mythological stories, one in the earlier part of the *Fonteinne amoureuse*, one in the later part.

In his *complainte*, the nobleman tells the story of Ceyx and Alcyone and draws a parallel between Ceyx and himself. Ceyx died at sea; his fate was unknown to Alcyone until she prayed to Juno. Juno had the god of sleep send Morpheus to show Alcyone what happened. Morpheus took the form of Ceyx - the dead Ceyx - and Alcyone awoke to hold him, but he vanished. Juno turned the lovers into sea birds - now called 'alcyones'. Thus just as Morpheus took the form of Ceyx, who had been separated from Alcyone by sea, and appeared to Alcyone, the nobleman wishes Morpheus to appear to his beloved. Machaut stresses the parallels between Ceyx and the nobleman.[66] Ceyx is literally dead, and the nobleman is half dead from love. His *complainte* is 'une dolereuse complainte' (v.214) that burns his heart and makes him grow pale; it is filled with images of death.[67] The amorous fountain has killed many lovers (vv.1411-20), and the nobleman has drunk so much that he considèrs himself dead (vv.1437-38). Ceyx has been separated by sea from his beloved; the nobleman must leave his beloved (e.g. vv.200, 236, etc.) and he will be separated from her by sea (v.479). This parallel explains an inconsistency in the nobleman's *complainte*: he speaks simultaneously as if he must leave his beloved and as if they were already apart.[68] Thus when he says his beloved is beyond the sea, he speaks as one in the position of Ceyx, stressing the typological parallel between his situation and the myth.

If we turn to the interpretation of Ceyx and Alcyone in Book 11 of the *Ovide moralisé*, Machaut's source, what light is shed on the nobleman? Ceyx's ship is the human body; the sea is life with its winds of sin and waves of convoitise, and the *Ovide moralisé* warns that all will be put to perdition, and rulers toppled (11.4085-92). People are so in love with their dishonest lives that they do not look to their own welfare - even those of high rank (11.4107-10). And ladies and gentlemen who immerse themselves in worldly delights can be called birds because worldly delight is so changeable that it is like a bird; when these birds fly after worldly goods, it is a sign of imminent perdition (11.4133-47). A long passage early in the *Fonteinne amoureuse* suggests that the nobleman's realm is teetering on the edge of destruction (vv.1161-1204).[69]

Turning to the Judgment of Paris, we see a similar parallel. The nobleman compares himself to Paris, claiming that he loves his lady more than Paris loved Helen (vv.344-46). And in the *vergier*, scenes on the fountain show a weeping Helen being led to Troy, the battle between Achilles and Hector, and the love of Troilus and Briseyde.

Then in the dream, Venus narrates the Judgment of Paris, beginning with the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. And since Peleus and Thetis were the parents of Achilles, she recalls that Achilles was one of the heroes who destroyed Troy. Thus we are reminded - by this reference and by the fountain's image of Achilles and Hector battling - what Paris's judgment caused. Venus also describes how she, Juno, and Pallas were sitting at a table when Discorde threw the apple, how the goddesses argued about who deserved it and how finally Paris was asked to judge. Won over by Venus's bribe, he awarded her the apple, declaring he preferred the estate of chevalerie to the life of a shepherd (vv.2125-43). Son of Priam and Hecuba, the king and queen of Troy, he had been raised by shepherds after Hecuba dreamed a firebrand issued from her body and destroyed Troy.

As I have pointed out elsewhere,[70] the *Ovide moralisé*'s interpretation of the Judgment of Paris is highly relevant to the *Fonteinne amoureuse*. Paris's choice among the goddesses is seen as a choice among lives: the active life (Juno), the contemplative life (Pallas), and the voluptuous life (Venus). Choosing Venus is the worst choice and it causes the fall of Troy. As the nobleman resembled Ceyx, so does he resemble Paris. Of each it is said that 'il sambloit estre fils a roy' ('he seemed to be the son of a king'; vv.1158, 1886), and, like Paris, he receives his lady from Venus - the lady from whom he had said he was separated by sea. Paris sails from Troy to Greece to win Helen. And just as Paris's action caused the destruction of his realm, this nobleman's realm may be in danger as well, as suggested by the passage I referred to above (vv.1161-1204).

The parallels between the nobleman's and Paris's stories reinforce the typological echo between the poem and the myth. The myths echo the narrative substance of the poem, inviting us to read the nobleman's story allegorically - just as in the *Rose* with Amant and the stories of Narcissus and Pygmalion. Thus Machaut's long apprenticeship to the *Rose* ultimately resulted in his most successful homage to Guillaume and Jean.

NOTES

[1] See Margaret J. Ehrhart, 'Irony and Audience: What Machaut Did Not Borrow from the *Roman de la Rose*', *Reading Medieval Studies* 23 (1997) 3-33.

[2] On allegory, see Jean Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie: Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*, Paris, Editions Montaigne, 1958; Graham Hough, 'The Allegorical Circle', *Critical Quarterly* 3 (1961) 199-209; Morton W. Bloomfield, 'A Grammatical Approach to Personification Allegory', *Modern Philology* 60 (1963) 161-171; Hans Robert Jauss, 'La transformation de la forme allégorique entre 1180 et 1240: d'Alain de Lille à Guillaume de Lorris', pp.107-46 in *L'humanisme médiéval dans les littératures romanes du xiie au xive siècle*, ed. Anthime Fourrier, Paris, Klincksieck, 1964; Jon Whitman, *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1987; Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale*, Paris, Seuil, 1972.

[3] Pépin, *op. cit.*, p.87; Whitman, *op. cit.*, p.263. Angus Fletcher (*Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1964, p.73) believes that allegory is great in part because it is obscure; Maureen Quilligan (*The Language of Allegory*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1979, p.29) says that the reader is led to 'a sense of the sacred'.

[4] See Fletcher, *op. cit.*, p.107; Stephen A. Barney (*Allegories of History, Allegories of Love*, Hamden, Conn., Archon, 1979; p.20) also cites 'discontinuity of form'.

[5] According to Pépin, *op.cit.*, pp.125-27, personification is likely to have derived in part from the etymological technique of allegorical interpretation in ancient times; Marc-René Jung (*Etudes sur le poème allégorique en France au moyen âge*, Berne, Francke, 1971, pp.19-20) would limit all medieval allegory to personification allegory. See also Fletcher, *op. cit.* p.26 and Whitman, *op. cit.* p.4.

[6] Cf. Hans Robert Jauss, 'Allégorie, "remythisation" et nouveau mythe: Réflections sur la captivité chrétienne de la mythologie au moyen âge', in *Mélanges d'histoire littéraire, de linguistique et de philologie romanes offerts à Charles Rostaing*, Liège, Association de Romanistes de l'Université de Liège, 1974, vol.1, pp.476-77.

[7] Rosemund Tuve (*Allegorical Imagery: Some Mediaeval Books and Their Posterity*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1966, p.22) sees allegory as concerned with 'great public images' such as 'quest, pilgrimage, death, birth, purgation'; Barney (*op. cit.*, p.16) also sees the presence of allegory signaled by certain 'forms, themes, and motifs'.

[8] See for example Paul Zumthor's *Essai de poétique médiévale* , pp.130-131, or his 'Récit et anti-récit: le *Roman de la Rose*', in *Langue, texte,*

énigme, Paris, Seuil, 1975, p.256. Jung (*op. cit.* pp.10, 200) makes a similar distinction.

9 Cf. Barney, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17, 32-33, 38.

10 Quotes from *The Fountain of Love (La Fonteinne Amoureuse) and Two Other Love Vision Poems*, ed. R. Barton Palmer, New York, Garland, 1993; I also consulted Ernest Hoepffner's edition (*Vergier: Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1908, vol.1, pp.13-56). Line numbers are the same in both editions.

11 *Vergier*, v.55; *Rose*, vv. 1625-26. All citations of the *Rose* are to the edition by Félix Lecoy (Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, Paris, Champion, 1966-70, 3 vol.).

12 See Kevin Brownlee, *Poetic Identity in Guillaume de Machaut*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press,1984; p.31.

13 See Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.28; also William Calin, 'The Poet at the Fountain: Machaut as Narrative Poet', in Madeleine Pelner Cosman and Bruce Chandler eds., *Machaut's World: Science and Art in the Fourteenth Century*, New York, New York Academy of Sciences, 1978, esp. p.182; and William Calin, 'Problèmes de technique narrative au moyen âge: *Le Roman de la Rose* et Guillaume de Machaut', in *Mélanges de langue et littérature françaises du moyen âge offerts à Pierre Jonin*, Aix-en-Provence, CUERMA, 1979, esp. pp.131-32.

14 See A.C. Spearing, *Medieval Dream Poetry*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1976; Jean Rychner, 'La flèche et l'anneau', *Revue des Sciences Humaines* 183 (1981) 55-69; Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.27.

15 I consulted the following editions of the *Behaingne*: *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1908, vol.1, pp.57-135; *Le Jugement dou roy de Behaingne*, ed. R. Barton Palmer, New York, Garland, 1984; *Le Jugement dou roy de Behaingne and Remede de Fortune*, ed. James I. Wimsatt and William W. Kibler, Athens, Georgia, University of Georgia Press, 1988. On its relation to the *Rose*, see more especially R. Barton Palmer, 'The Metafictional Machaut: Self Reflexivity and Self-Mediation in the Two Judgment Poems', *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 20.1 (Spring 1987) 23-39.

16 Hoepffner 1, xvi, lxii; Wimsatt and Kibler, p.3.

17 Palmer, *Le Jugement dou roy de Behaingne*, xxix.

18 See Douglas Kelly, *Medieval Imagination: Rhetoric and the Poetry of Courtly Love*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press,1978, p.139.

[19] See William Calin, *A Poet at the Fountain: Essays on the Narrative Verse of Guillaume de Machaut*, Lexington, University Press of Kentucky, 1974, esp. pp.39-40. Also on the *Behaingne* as a love debate, see Hoepffner 1: lx-lxi ; Palmer, xxix-xxxii; Wimsatt and Kibler, p.9. For a similar theme, see Andreas Capellanus, *The Art of Courtly Love*, transl. John Jay Parry, New York , Frederick Ungar, 1941 (repr.1959), pp.162-63.

[20] See Kelly, *Medieval Imagination*, pp.139-41, on how she evokes Raison in the *Rose*; for Raison as a scold in the *Rose*, see vv. 2982-3056.

[21] I consulted the following editions of the *Remede*: *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1911, vol.2, pp.1-157; *Le Jugement dou roy de Behaingne and Remede de Fortune*, eds. James I Wimsatt and William W. Kibler, Athens, Georgia, University of Georgia Press, 1988. All citations from Wimsatt and Kibler.

[22] Sylvia Huot, *From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1987, esp. p.250; Wimsatt and Kibler, p.35.

[23] Wimsatt and Kibler, p.494.

[24] Kelly, p.4; Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.63.

[25] Brownlee notes that the fleeing narrator inverts Amant's joyful approach to the Rose (*Poetic Identity*, p.42); see Kelly, pp.121-22, on various parallels both inside and outside the garden.

[26] On Hedin, see Wimsatt and Kibler, pp.35-36; on the dance of the *Rose* displaced outside the garden, see Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.55.

[27] On the *Remede*'s debt to the *Consolation of Philosophy*, see Hoepffner 2, xix-xxxii; Calin, *A Poet*, pp.57-62; Kelly, p.130; Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.230, n.22.

[28] Wimsatt and Kibler, pp.38, 495.

[29] Wimsatt and Kibler, pp.501-2.

[30] See Pierre-Yves Badel, *Le Roman de la Rose au XIVe siècle: Etude de la réception de l'oeuvre*, Geneva, Droz, 1980, p.89.

[31] Spearing observes that the *Consolation of Philosophy* is in large part 'not susceptible of allegorical interpretation at all, except in so far as a conversation between Boethius and Philosophy can be seen to correspond to a process of thought within Boethius himself' (p.19).

[32] Citations of the *Lyon* are to *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1911, vol. 2, pp.159-237.

[33] *'Le bestiaires d'amours' di Maistre Richart Fornival e 'Le response du bestiaire'*, ed. Cesare Segre, Milan, Ricciardi, 1957. On the bestiary tradition in the *Lyon*, see Hoepffner 2, lix, lxii; Robert Deschaux, 'Le bestiaire de Guillaume de Machaut d'après les dits', *Cahiers de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Françaises* 31 (1979) 7-16; Kelly, p.96; Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, pp.176-77, 248 n.10; Huot, pp.193-201.

[34] Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.183.

[35] Hoepffner, 2, lviii; Howard Rollin Patch, *The Other World,* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1950, esp. ch. 7; Calin, *A Poet*, pp.80-81.

[36] Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, transl. Richard Green, New York, Bobbs-Merrill, 1962, p.22.

[37] Guillaume de Machaut, *Dit de la fleur de lis et de la Marguerite*, in *The Marguerite Poetry of Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. James I. Wimsatt, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1970; vv.207-208.

[38] Guillaume de Machaut, *Le Livre du Voir-dit*, ed. Paulin Paris, Paris, 1875; vv.4926-41.

[39] Nicole Amon, 'Le vert: Guillaume de Machaut, poète de l'affirmation et de la joie', *Revue du Pacifique: Etudes de Littérature Française* 2 (1976) 3-11 (9); Wimsatt and Kibler, note to vv.1901-10.

[40] Earl G. Schreiber, 'Venus in the Medieval Mythographic Tradition', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 74 (1975) 519-35 (529).

[41] Calin, *A Poet*, pp.75-76; also Deschaux, 'Le bestiaire', p.14.

[42] D.W. Robertson, *A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1962, p.233; Thomas Vesce, 'Love as Found in Machaut's *Dit dou lyon*', *Romance Notes* 11 (1969) 174-80 (174); Calin, *A Poet*, pp.77-78, 91.

[43] Kelly, pp.151-52; Brownlee notes extended metaphors and commentary, cites a commentary with the *Ovide moralisé* (*Poetic Identity*, pp.63-64, 66, 232, n.34).

[44] Citations of the *Alerion* are to *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1911, vol. 2, pp.239-403. On the bestiary tradition applied to love, see Kelly, pp.151-52; on the appropriateness of parallels between love and falconry, see Calin, *A Poet*, pp.94-95.

[45] For evidence that the narrator progresses in love, note the appeal at the end: 'Amez, si comme j'ay amé./ Vous n'en porrez estre blasmé,/ Mais bonnement vous loera / Qui Bonne Amour congnoistera' (vv.4789-92). But see Calin, *A Poet* p.102, who does not see a progression. Kelly (p.151) notes that birds are ranked according to their nobility in the falconry tradition; Brownlee (*Poetic Identity*, p.84) notes that the teachings of Amour are anticourtly and lead the narrator to react more rationally to his losses. Observe that Amour is not the God of Love but a personified abstraction, and grammatically feminine: Bonne Amour. On Amour as feminine, see Jean Frappier, 'D'amors, par amors', *Romania* 88 (1967) 433-74 (434).

[46] Ovidius Naso, *The Art of Love and The Remedies of Love*, transl. J.H. Mozley, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1962 (repr. of 1929 ed.), pp. 15, 31 (*Art*), 211 (*Remedies*); Andreas Capellanus, pp.31, 46-47, 63.

[47] Here Machaut is refuting the courtly love theme that only love attained through long service is valid. See Ovid, p.159; Andreas Capellanus, pp.43-44, 132, 148-49, 185; the *Rose*, vv.21537-42.

[48] Lovers who love in this way will be freed from the service of those who love *par amour*. As Hoepffner prints the passage, it reads 'des servages affranchis/ Ou cil sont qui par Amours *n'aimment*' (vv.1934-35; my italics). But a glance at the variant readings shows that two mss., A and C, omit the negative. In the *Rose*, Amant's homage to the God of Love is referred to as love 'par amour' (v.4222). See also *Behaingne*, v.765; *Remede*, v.3428; *Confort d'ami*, v.2722; *Fonteinne amoureuse*, vv.303,1446.

[49] Machaut could have found this theme in the *Rose* too: vv.8421-24, 9396-9400.

[50] Mary Ann Burke, 'A Medieval Experiment in Adaptation: Typology and Courtly Love: Poetry in the Second Rhetoric', *Res Publica Litterarum: Studies in the Classical Tradition* 3 (1980) 165-75. On exempla in medieval literature, see Kurt O. Olsson, 'Rhetoric, John Gower, and the Late Medieval *Exemplum*', *Medievalia et Humanistica* 8 (1977) 185-200; on exempla used in Machaut's debate poems as proof of arguments, see Kelly, p.150. Burke sees exempla in the *Navarre* as being like biblical typology in 'the idea of recurring patterns' (pp.167-68), but I think that typology is a more sophisticated concept and we have to look to the *Fonteinne amoureuse* for typological use of exempla.

[51]Calin, *A Poet*, p.41; R. Barton Palmer ed., *Le jugement dou roy de Navarre*, by Guillaume de Machaut, New York, Garland, 1988, p.xxxii. For the text, I consulted Palmer's edition of the *Navarre* as well as *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1908, vol.1, pp.137-282. Line numbers are the same in both editions.

[52] Cornelis de Boer, 'Guillaume de Machaut et l'*Ovide moralisé*', *Romania* 43 (1914) 335-46; '"Ovide moralisé": Poème du commencement du quatorzième siècle', ed. Cornelis de Boer, *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde*, NS 15, 21, 30, 36-37, 43-44, Amsterdam 1915-38. Subsequent citations of the *Ovide moralisé* are to this edition.

[53] Concerning the Jason and Medea story, Burke (p.172) observes that Machaut manipulates meaning, based on the *Ovide moralisé* version of the story, 'to fit context and authorial intention'. But in fact I would say that he did not manipulate it enough.

[54] I consulted the following editions of the *Confort*: *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1921, vol.3, pp.1-142; *Le confort d'ami*, ed. R. Barton Palmer, New York, Garland, 1992 . Citations are to Palmer's edition. On the date and occasion, see Roland Delachenal, *Histoire de Charles V*, Paris, Alphonse Picard, 1909, vol.1, pp.150-57; Hoepffner 3:i; Deschaux, 61; and in particular, Palmer, *Le confort*, pp.xvi-xxv.

[55] Hoepffner 3, viii-ix.

[56] Also from the *Ovide moralisé*; see Hoepffner 3, vii.

[57] Also from the *Ovide moralisé*; see Hoepffner 3, vii-viii, n.3.

[58] Kelly too notes (p.125) that the exempla undercut the point.

[59] Citations of the *Fonteinne amoureuse* are to *Le livre de la fontaine amoureuse*, ed. Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet, Paris, Stock, 1993. I also consulted Palmer's edition (see n.10) as well as *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1921, vol.3, pp.143-244. The poem was written between 1357-64 (see Hoepffner 3, xxix. I do not accept his more precise date of 1360-61 because I do not accept his identification of the central character as the Duc de Berry; see Margaret J. Ehrhart, 'Machaut's *Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse*, the Choice of Paris, and the Duties of Rulers', *Philological Quarterly* 59 (1980) 119-39).

[60] Laurence de Looze, 'Guillaume de Machaut and the Writerly Process', *French Forum* 9 (1984) 145-61 (152). But one looks into Narcissus's fountain; one must drink from the fountain in the *Fonteinne amoureuse*.

Huot (pp.299-300) suggests that the fountain derives from the *Fonteinne d'amours* by Watriquet de Couvain . As he did in the *Vergier*, Machaut makes his *vergier* contain the dream, whereas in the *Rose* the dream contained the *vergier*: see Rychner, pp.58-65; Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, pp.200-1.

[61] Brownlee, *Poetic Identity*, p.197.

[62] Brownlee, 'Transformations', p.16.

[63] Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *The Romance of the Rose*, transl. Charles Dahlberg, Hanover, New Hampshire, University Press of New England, 1986 (repr. of 1971 ed.), p.330.

[64] De Looze, p.145, and on the narrator as Morpheus, p.156; Cerquiglini-Toulet, pp.10-11.

[65] On the reader as a producer of meaning in allegory, see Quilligan, p.21. A passage early in the poem (vv.13-22) seems to request a discerning audience: 'Or pri a ceuls qui le liront/ Qui le bien dou mal esliront,/ S'il y est, qu'il veuillent au lire/ Laissier le mal, le bien eslire,/ Car quant la chose est bien eslite,/ Par raison, homs plus s'i delite,/ Et dames et cils qui le lit/ Penre y doivent plus grant delit,/ Et cils dont il sera leus/ Soit ou nombre des esleus.'

[66] On this parallel, see Calin, *A Poet*, p.85; de Looze, p.156.

[67] E.g., vv.251-55, 363-78, 467-70, 475-77.

[68] E.g., vv.200-203, 275-80, 1449-51, but 411-16, 493, 533-34, 819-23. The lover separated from his beloved or anticipating separation is a courtly love theme that we find in the God of Love's instructions to Amant in the *Rose* (vv.2287-88, 2555-62). Also recall that the nobleman says he loves his lady better than Paris loved Helen, and in that tradition, they were separated by sea; earlier he says he is in exile, possibly a parallel with the noble Paris exiled among shepherds.

[69] Cf. Brownlee, who says that Machaut 'demoralizes' this story, as well as the Judgment of Paris (*Poetic Identity*, pp.202, 250, n.26).

[70] Ehrhart, 'Machaut's *Dit de la fonteinne amoureuse*', 128-31; Margaret J. Ehrhart, *The Judgment of the Trojan Prince Paris in Medieval Literature*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987, pp.139-41.